



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same beneficent end, that we find the best and the strongest hope of what in my heart I believe to be the greatest of all reforms — the establishment of peace upon earth. [Cheers.]

A Strange Contrast.

BY DAVID LLOYD-GEORGE, BRITISH CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

[The following is the substance of the admirable speech of Mr. Lloyd-George at the great public meeting of the Peace Congress in Queen's Hall, London, July 28.]

It really seems incredible when you begin to reflect upon it that it should be necessary in the twentieth century of the Christian era to hold a meeting in a civilized country to protest against an expenditure by Christian communities of £400,000,000 a year upon preparing one nation to kill another. [Shame.] It is still more amazing that the leaders of opinion should be more engrossed on the perfecting and rendering more deadly of the machinery of human slaughter than upon setting up some tribunal for the peaceful adjustment of disputes.

If one statesman has a dispute with another he settles it by arbitration or conference, but the moment he undertakes to settle for other people he at once resorts to the machinery of assassination. But why? Do the nations hate each other? In Germany there are a number of people who produce beet. They sell masses of it to us. Why should they kill their best customers? That is the worst way of getting on in business. We buy £10,000,000 of goods from Germany. Why should they kill us? They buy about £30,000,000 of goods from us. Well, really, when a man comes to your shop like this you don't knock him down with a cannon ball. That is not the way to increase your trade. It is time to exercise a little more common sense.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF MOTIVES.

And yet, while we are buying and selling peaceably, Germans to us and we to Germans, profiting by each other's trade, we are building ships and arming to fight. Why do nine-tenths of these disputes come? Nine-tenths of these disputes arise from misunderstanding of each other's motives. There are people in this country in a very exalted position and of great experience firmly under the impression that Germany means to attack us. There are people in Germany equally convinced that we are preparing to attack them. From fear of each other we are arming and rushing into the very quarrel we are afraid of. We have exactly the same state of things with France. I was very interested to read one of the speeches of Richard Cobden delivered in 1853 at a peace meeting in Manchester. I advise you to read that speech. There is not an argument they advance about Germany now that they did not advance about France then.

AN UNDERSTANDING WITH GERMANY.

There has not been a new scare invented for sixty years. The only thing that is real is the expenditure. We say, in order to secure ourselves against invasion, we must have a two-power standard navy. Look at the position of Germany. Her army is to her what our navy is to us — the sole defense against invasion. She has not a two-power standard. She may have a larger army than either of her neighbors, but any combination of them

could pour in a larger number of troops. Would not we be frightened? Would not we arm? Of course we would. Germany is frightened for a reason that would have frightened us. What is wanted is a clearing up of misconceptions. It is deplorable that two great progressive communities like Germany and Britain should not be able to establish a good understanding. We have done it with France, with Russia and the United States of America. Why could not we rope Germany in?

THE REAL FOES TO FIGHT.

We spend in this country every year £60,000,000 of money on preparing for war. What a stupendous waste is that! What might have been done you can each imagine for yourself in trade, commerce, in improvement in the conditions of the people, in their enlightenment, in their development, in the general alleviation of suffering, and in raising the people above the level of despair. But are not there plenty worse enemies to fight than Germany — intemperance [Cheers], ignorance, vice, and that most dread of all invaders that sooner or later reaches every home? Are the dominions of death not wide enough that nations should spend £400,000,000 on extending them? There were Crusades in the Middle Ages, where princes and nations dropped their feuds and abandoned their quarrels for some great purpose. There are nobler purposes awaiting princes and peoples to-day. Let them cast aside suspicion, quarrels and feuds, and unite in redeeming humanity from the quagmire into which millions have sunk in misery and despair. [Loud applause.]

Justice and Peace—A Vision for Europe.

Address of Lord Courtney of Penwith, President, at the formal opening of the London Peace Congress in Caxton Hall, Tuesday morning, July 28.

We have a very rigid time-table, to which I propose to adhere strictly. I propose, therefore, to go at once to the single thought which I desire to submit to you in connection with this Congress, and that is the connection between justice and peace. Without justice we can have no guarantee of permanent peace. With justice the peace of the world is unassailable. There are words in an old poem — familiar to many generations of Englishmen, and in some sort familiar no doubt to our foreign friends — which often occur to my mind in relation to this thought. The words as we use them run thus:

“Mercy and Truth have met together;
Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.”

Righteousness and peace, or, as we say now, justice and peace. Without righteousness, no peace; with righteousness, perpetual peace. When injustice is once enthroned and in possession, there must be a perpetual desire to overthrow the injustice and establish right in its place; and when injustice possesses the minds of nations and rulers there is a perpetual instinct to be unjust and to establish that order of things against which we have to rebel.

I know there are some among us who believe that the only sure way to get rid of injustice is not to rise against it, but to observe the passive resistance of those who do not acknowledge and will not strike against the system. That is a noble creed. I would envy those who could